

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

ORACLE USA, INC., a Colorado corporation;)	
ORACLE AMERICA, INC., a Delaware)	
corporation; and ORACLE)	2:10-CV-00106-LRH-PAL
INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION, a)	
California corporation,)	
)	<u>ORDER</u>
Plaintiffs,)	
)	
v.)	
)	
RIMINI STREET, INC., a Nevada)	
corporation; SETH RAVIN, an individual,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

Before the court is interested party CedarCrestone, Inc.'s motion to seal portions of its reply. Doc. #353.¹ Also before the court is plaintiffs' motion to seal reply in support of motion for sanctions. Doc. #359.

As an initial matter, the court is acutely cognizant of the presumption in favor of public access to papers filed in the district court. *See Hagestad v. Tragesser*, 49 F.3d 1430, 1434 (9th Cir. 1995). Therefore, a party seeking to file materials under seal bears the burden of overcoming that presumption by showing that the materials are covered by an operative protective order and are also deserving of confidentiality. *See Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 331 F.3d 1122, 1135

¹Refers to the court's docket entry number.

1 (9th Cir. 2005). Specifically, a party must “articulate compelling reasons supported by specific
2 factual findings that outweigh the general history of access and the public policies favoring
3 disclosure.” *Kamakana, City and County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1179 (9th Cir. 2006)
4 (internal citations omitted).

5 Here, in this intellectual property action, the court has entered a protective order governing
6 documentation and testimony that is confidential to the parties’ internal research and development.
7 The court has reviewed the documents and pleadings on file in this matter and finds that documents
8 at issue in the present motions contain information that is designated “Confidential” and “Highly
9 Confidential” under the protective order. Therefore, the court finds that the parties have satisfied
10 their burdens to show compelling reasons for filing the various pleadings under seal. Accordingly,
11 the court shall grant the parties’ motions.

12
13 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that interested party’s motion to seal (Doc. #353) is
14 GRANTED.

15 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that plaintiffs’ motion to seal (Doc. #359) is GRANTED.

16 IT IS SO ORDERED.

17 DATED this 27th day of July, 2012.



18
19
20 LARRY R. HICKS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
21
22
23
24
25
26